

BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Reorganization & Regular Virtual Online Meeting
Tuesday, January 19, 2021
—MINUTES—

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Attorney Mr. Warner called the Virtual Online meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

ANNOUNCEMENT: For the duration of the Corona virus Health Emergency, the Municipal Complex is closed to the public, and meetings will be held digitally, connected by conferencing software provided by RingCentral.com. Members of the public are invited to view meetings live using RingCentral webinar, which also allows them to "raise a hand" and contribute when they are invited to do so during public portions of the meeting. Instructions for Virtual online meeting:

1. Download RingCentral meetings on preferred device:
<https://www.ringcentral.com/apps/rc-meetings>
2. At the advertised start time of the meeting, enter:<https://webinar.ringcentral.com/j/1496421557> into your browser. **This method allows listening & participation*

Please note: You may also join via telephone: Dial: +1(646)-357-3664, Webinar ID: 1496421557* *telephone access allows only listening and not participation.* If you would like to make a comment, text 1(908) 912-4247 with name, contact information and comment for the Board and it will read into the record.

2. OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT:

Both adequate and electronic notice of this meeting specifying the time, place and manner in which such notice was provided in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, and recently enacted Emergency Remote Meeting Protocols for Local Public Bodies, N.J.A.C. 5:39-1, et seq. Specifically, on December 2, 2020 proper notice was sent to the Courier News and the Star-Ledger and filed with the Clerk at the Township of Bridgewater and posted on the bulletin board at the Municipal Building. Public meetings are held with participants at remote locations, connected by conferencing software provided by RingCentral.com. Members of the public are invited to attend and participate in live meetings either by using the RingCentral client, which allows audio and video participation, or by phoning into a meeting for audio only participation. The required access information is provided in the notice, as well as set forth on the agenda.

The procedures and requirements for making public comment are as follows: Attendees are admitted to meetings via the waiting room and microphones are muted until enabled by the host. Members of the public may participate in meetings at certain designated times as announced by the Board Chair. Members of the public will be allowed to address applicants and their experts, ask questions and/or make comments as appropriate once recognized to do so. Attendees may request to be heard by 'raising a hand', either physically or virtually.

Regulation of conduct by members of the public on the remote public meeting shall be consistent with law and practices followed if a member of the public disrupts an in-person meeting. Specifically, if a member of the public becomes disruptive during any period for public comment, the member of the public shall be muted and warned that continued disruption may result in him or her being prevented from speaking during the remote public meeting or removed from the remote public meeting. Disruptive conduct includes sustained inappropriate behaviors, such as, but not necessarily

limited to, shouting, interruption, and use of profanity. A member of the public who continues to act in a disruptive manner after receiving a warning may be muted while other members of the public are allowed to proceed with their questions or comments. If time permits, the disruptive individual shall be allowed to speak after all other members of the public have been given the opportunity to make their comment. Should the person remain disruptive, the individual may be muted or kept on mute for the remainder of the remote public meeting, or removed from the remote public meeting. Please be aware of the Zoning Board of Adjustment policy for public hearings: No new applications will be heard after 10:00 pm and no new testimony will be taken after 10:30 pm.

3. SALUTE TO FLAG:

4. OATH OF OFFICE:

4a. Regular Member – John Fallone Exp; 12/31/2024

4b. Regular Member – Daniel Ahern Exp; 12/31/2024

4c. Alternate 1 – Andrew Fresco Exp; 12/31/2021

4d. Alternate 2 – Gary La Spisa Exp; 12/31/2022

4e. Alternate 3 – Kevin Wrobel Exp; 12/31/2022

4f. Alternate 4 – Bruce Bongiorno Exp; 12/31/2021

(All members listed were sworn into oath of office by attorney, Mr. Steven Warner, Esq.)

Others present: Attorney Mr. Steven Warner, Esq., Engineer Mr. William Burr, IV, PE., Planner Ms. Scarlett Doyle, PP. and Land Use Coordinator Ms. Zuzana Karas

5. ROLL CALL:

Donald Sweeney- present

James Weideli - present

John Fallone - present

Dawn Guttschall- present

Pushpavati Amin-present

Bruce Bongiorno-present

Jeff Foose - present

Daniel Ahern- present

Kevin Wrobel - present

Andrew Fresco -present

Gary La Spisa - present

6. REORGANIZATION:

6a. Election of Chairperson

Attorney Mr. Steven Warner, Esq., asked the board for a nomination for the board's chairperson position for 2021.

Mr. Ahern made a nomination to elect Mr. Jeff Foose, with a second made by Ms. Guttschall followed by a roll call vote:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Ahern, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli and Mr. Foose

DENIED: Mr. Sweeney, Ms. Amin, and Mr. Fallone

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

Mr. Foose having four out of the seven votes was appointed to the chairman for the 2021 year.

(The meeting was handed over to the appointed chair, Mr. Foose.)

6b. Election of Vice-Chairperson

Chairman Mr. Foose asked the board for a nomination for the Vice-Chairperson position for 2021.

Ms. Guttschall made a nomination to elect Mr. Fallone, with a second made by Chairman Mr. Foose. Before a roll call could be taken, Mr. Fallone respectfully withdrew his name from the nomination.

A second nomination made by Chairman Mr. Foose was made to nominate Mr. Weideli with a second by Mr. Ahern followed by a roll call vote:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Fallone, Mr. Ahern, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli and Mr. Foose

DENIED: Ms. Amin

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

6c.Appointment of Board Secretary

Chairman Mr. Foose asked the board for a nomination for the Board Secretary position for 2021.

Ms. Guttashall made a nomination to elect Mr. Ahern, with a second made by Mr. Weideli followed by a roll call vote:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Ahern, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli, and Mr. Foose

DENIED: Ms. Amin and Mr. Fallone

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

6d.Appointment of Assistant Board Secretary

Chairman Mr. Foose asked the board for a nomination for the Assistant Board Secretary position for 2021.

Chairman Mr. Foose made a nomination to elect Ms. Doyle, with a second made by Mr. Weideli followed by a roll call vote:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Ahern, Ms. Amin, Mr. Fallone, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli, and Mr. Foose

DENIED: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

6e.Appointment of Board Professional(s):

- i. Board Attorney – Mr. Steven K. Warner, Esq.

Chairman Mr. Foose asked the board for a motion and a second to approve the resolution appointing Mr. Warner as the Board's Attorney for 2021.

Ms. Guttashall made a motion with a second made by Mr. Weideli followed by a roll call vote:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Ahern, Ms. Amin, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli, and Mr. Foose

DENIED: None

ABSTAIN: Mr. Fallone

ABSENT: None

NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

- ii. Board Engineer – Mr. William H. Burr, PE

Chairman Mr. Foose asked the board for a motion and a second to approve the resolution appointing Mr. Burr as the Board's Engineer for 2021.

Mr. Weideli made a motion with a second made by Chairman Mr. Foose followed by a roll call vote:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Ahern, Mr. Fallone, Ms. Amin, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli, and Mr. Foose
DENIED: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

- iii Board Planner – Ms. Scarlett Doyle, PP
Chairman Mr. Foose asked the board for a motion and a second to approve the resolution appointing Ms. Doyle as the Board’s Planner for 2021.
Mr. Weideli made a motion with a second made by Chairman Mr. Foose followed by a roll call vote:
AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Ahern, Mr. Fallone, Ms. Amin, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli, and Mr. Foose
DENIED: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

6f. Designation of Meeting Dates, Time, and Place

The Chairman asked if any comments would like to be made, in which the date November 2nd was considered and ultimately removed from the meeting dates.

Chairman Mr. Foose asked for a motion and a second to approve the Designation of Meeting Dates, Time, and Place for 2021 with the removal of November 2nd, 2021.

Mr. Weideli made a motion with a second made by Ms. Guttschall followed by a roll call vote:
AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Ahern, Mr. Fallone, Ms. Amin, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli, and Mr. Foose
DENIED: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

6g. Designation of Official Newspapers

Chairman Mr. Foose asked for a motion and a second to approve the Designation of Official Newspapers for 2021.

Mr. Ahern made a motion with a second made by Ms. Guttschall followed by a roll call vote:
AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Ahern, Mr. Fallone, Ms. Amin, Ms. Guttschall, Mr. Weideli, and Mr. Foose
DENIED: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel and Mr. Bongiorno

The chairman recommended the board take a quick break. Upon return, at 8 pm, a roll call vote was taken to ensure all board members and board professionals had returned.

5. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL:

September 15, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)

September 29, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)
October 6, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)
October 20, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)
November 17, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)
December 1, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)
December 15, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)
December 22, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)

6. MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTIONS:

None

7. HEARING AND DELIBERATIONS:

SKYMANOR PROPERTIES, LLC - 5 SKY HIGH TERRACE

Block 904 Lot 5

#20-007-ZB - Variance -Construct New Home on Vacant Lot

The Applicant's counsel, Mr. Belardo, summarized further changes to the application. He explained that the Applicant had (1) relocated the dwelling approximately 7 feet closer to Sky High Terrace, thereby allowing the Applicant to save three (3) additional trees; (2) reduced the proposed impervious coverage to 34.6% by converting the proposed patio to a wood deck and replacing the asphalt driveway with permeable pavers/asphalt (the latter having no impact on impervious coverage as permeable pavers still count towards impervious coverage); (3) added stairs to the retaining walls for access purposes and including the impervious coverage associated with the walls in the total impervious coverage calculation; and (4) included an additional drain inlet to capture driveway runoff and direct it into the proposed drywells.

Mr. Parker testified that, by relocating the dwelling closer to Sky High Terrace, the Applicant reduced the driveway's length and reduced the amount of disturbance proposed from approximately 15,000 square feet to about 14,000 square feet. Additionally, the Applicant reduced the number of trees being removed from 39 trees to 36 trees. Mr. Parker testified that the Applicant is now proposing to use pervious pavers and to construct a deck rather than a patio. He further testified that the Applicant modified the retaining walls to include stairs and increased the number of drywells.

Mr. Parker advised that he did not believe blasting would be necessary because the Applicant, utilizing test pits in the proposed location of the dwelling and the drywells, determined that the soil conditions were favorable. During a discussion of Mr. Burr's January 14, 2021, Review Report, Mr. Parker addressed the requirements set forth in Section 126-265 of the Township's Hillside Development Ordinance. Such ordinance providing the Board to review and approve only applications where development plans and necessary improvements accomplish the following:

1. Control velocity and rate of water runoff so that such velocity and rate are no greater after construction and development than before and all other provisions of the Bridgewater Township Stormwater Control and Floodplain Ordinance have been complied with;
2. Minimize stream turbidity and changes in flow;
3. Protect environmentally vulnerable areas;
4. Stabilize exposed soils both during and after construction and development;
5. Prevent soil slippage;
6. Minimize number and extent of cuts to prevent groundwater discharge areas; and
7. Preserve the maximum number of trees and other vegetation on the site and avoid the critical upland forest areas as shown on the vegetation map of the Township's natural resources inventory.

Mr. Parker testified that the Applicant would control the velocity and rate of runoff by using drywells that will capture roof and driveway runoff and an inlet to intercept runoff onto adjacent properties. He explained that environmentally vulnerable areas would be protected because the Applicant is not proposing any disturbance of the very steep slopes greater than 30%. Mr. Parker testified that the Applicant would stabilize exposed soils in accordance with the ordinance requirements, and he stipulated, as a condition of approval, to including a deed restriction regarding the maintenance of the stormwater management system. He explained that the Applicant will not be cutting into the land but instead filling it and that the Applicant had revised the plans and overall proposed to further reduce the extent of tree removal.

Mr. Parker introduced into evidence, as Exhibit A-4, a Grading Plan Exhibit dated November 5, 2020, last revised January 4, 2021. Mr. Parker explained that 36 trees are proposed to be removed but that he does not believe the property can accommodate all of the required replacement trees. Instead, he suggested that the Applicant plant six (6) replacement trees and, as to the balance of the removed trees, the Applicant would donate to the designated Tree Replacement Fund. As a condition of approval, the Applicant stipulated to planting as many trees as possible and donating to the Tree Replacement Fund. Mr. Parker testified that the Applicant proposes to connect the drainage system to the existing storm system within a drainage easement on the adjacent property (Lot 6). He explained that he did not believe the Applicant would need permission to do so. Mr. Burr advised that he has no concerns with the overflow pipe discharging to grade, as long as the discharge area is stabilized to prevent erosion if there is overflow (e.g., riprap), the Applicant agreed. Mr. Parker testified that stormwater runoff would be directed downhill away from the adjacent neighboring properties. He explained that a drain inlet would capture the area between the proposed retaining walls at the edge of the lower wall that will connect to the drywell.

During a discussion on the proposed retaining walls, Mr. Parker noted that the Applicant had significantly reduced the height of the walls from 17 feet to less than 7 feet. During questioning whether the walls could be constructed given the existing grades, Mr. Burr opined that they could be so constrained. He advised that he did not think the walls needed to be specifically designed by a structural engineer. On the discussion of the proposed driveway and the existing conservation easement, Mr. Parker testified that the Applicant had obtained authorization to construct the proposed driveway and had submitted a copy. He explained that the driveway would be 10 feet wide and that it should be sufficient for safety vehicles to access the property. Mr. Parker continued to testify that, while a fire truck could not turn around on the property other emergency vehicles should be able to do so. During a discussion of whether the sanitary sewer/water connections could be made within the existing easement, Mr. Parker opined that they could be located, but, in the alternative, he opined that the Applicant could connect using a gravity main or pump to adjoining Lot 6. Mr. Burr advised that Mr. Parker's suggestion is viable concurred with the option.

During a discussion of the pervious driveway, the Applicant stipulated, as a condition of approval, to filing a deed restriction to ensure the driveway's future maintenance and that such driveway should not be removed by a subsequent purchaser.

Discussion on the proposed lighting was addressed. The Applicant stipulated that any new exterior lighting would be directed downward and/or appropriately shielded to eliminate light spillage onto adjacent properties. As to the grading, the Applicant stipulated to submit a grading and sewer design plan to the Township Engineering Department to secure a building permit. Mr. Parker again advised that blasting would not be required for this project. Mr. Parker, on behalf of the Applicant, stipulated to the balance of the conditions set forth in Mr. Burr's January 14, 2021 Review Report. The Fire Official also reviewed the plans and provided comments. Mr. Burr explained that the Fire Official

would have to review and approve the plans as part of the compliance process if the application should be approved.

Ms. Natalee Picilo Huber, residing at 1302 Sky High Terrace (Lot 6), questioned whether the Applicant could construct a smaller dwelling to reduce the deviations. Mr. Parker conceded that, while the variances cannot be eliminated, they would be reduced if the Applicant reduced the dwelling's size. He further conceded that a smaller house would reduce the FAR and coverage and reduce the amount of steep slope disturbance. Ms. Huber questioned the design of the walls and the impact of such walls on her property, particularly given the property's downward slope towards her lot. Mr. Parker agreed that there is a slope between the proposed retaining walls that drains toward Ms. Huber's property, but he contended that the Applicant would install an inlet that would capture runoff and direct it into a drywell. During a further discussion on the sufficiency of the proposed drywell system, Mr. Burr suggested that the Applicant design the drywells for a 100-year storm event which the Applicant agreed to. The discussion continued to the location of the lower retaining wall. Mr. Burr observed that Ms. Huber's property is located quite close. Mr. Burr questioned whether the Applicant could shorten the wall or locate it elsewhere and install a swale or berm along the property lines. Mr. Parker, on behalf of the Applicant, agreed to do so.

During the discussion of the proposed walkout basement, Mr. Parker contended that this space is not a basement but rather a cellar as per the ordinance. He asserted that not more than one-half of the foundation is exposed and, therefore, such square footage is not included in the floor area calculation.

Jessica C. Caldwell, P.P. was duly sworn according to law, provided her qualifications, and was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of professional planning. Ms. Caldwell introduced into evidence, as Exhibit A-5, a Planning Report dated January 18, 2021. She explained that she conducted a study of the six "surrounding" properties on Sky High Terrace and Timberline Drive to determine that the average dwelling size is 3,500 square feet. The floor area of the Applicant's proposed dwelling is 2,993 square feet. Ms. Caldwell further explained that the average lot size of these six "surrounding" properties is 2.06 acres and the average gross FAR (not including steep slope adjustment) is 0.046. In contrast, this property has a lot size of 2.52 acres, and the proposed FAR is .0273 (inclusive of steep slope adjustment). She opined that the proposed dwelling is consistent with the larger neighborhood. Of the 32 "surrounding" properties in the "larger neighborhood", the proposed dwelling is either larger than or within 5% of the size of 81.25% of the surrounding properties.

Ms. Caldwell continued to testify that the Applicant is seeking the following variances: proposed FAR, existing lot width, proposed impervious coverage, proposed density, and proposed height of fences/retaining walls. She opined that the variance relief for the bulk variances (exclusive of the d(4) FAR variance) could be granted according to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(1), given the impact of the steep slopes. Ms. Caldwell explained that the standards set forth in the Hillside Development Ordinance make developing such a lot difficult, with less than 2,000 square feet of impervious coverage permitted. She opined that strict conformance with all of these standards rendered a dwelling construction that is consistent with the neighborhood nearly impossible. Ms. Caldwell further opined that the requested relief for the bulk variances also could be granted according to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(2), since, while a small dwelling would be able to be constructed within the bulk standards for the zone, as modified by the Hillside Development Ordinance, the Applicant's proposal represents a "better planning alternative." Ms. Caldwell explained that the proposed dwelling is more in keeping with the surrounding residences. Ms. Caldwell opined that the Applicant's proposal would not result in substantial detriment to the public good or substantial impairment to the zone's plan.

As to the requested d(4) FAR variance, Ms. Caldwell testified that the standard is whether the site will accommodate the problems associated with the proposed use, given that the proposal has a larger

FAR than the maximum permitted by the ordinance. She explained that the Applicant made numerous revisions to the plans to scale back the proposal, such that the development, in her opinion, would be consistent with the existing neighborhood. Ms. Caldwell testified that the Applicant had stipulated to a variety of conditions that would mitigate the detriments associated with the proposal, including the installation of stormwater management measures and the use of pervious pavers. She opined that the proposal advanced the purposes set forth in subsections (a), (e), and (g) of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2, in that it would promote the general welfare, promote the establishment of appropriate population densities, and provides sufficient space in appropriate locations. Ms. Caldwell further opined that the Applicant's proposal would be consistent with the Master Plan, which includes goals such as preservation of the developing character and quality of Bridgewater Township and the promotion of a well-balanced variety of residential, recreational, public, commercial, industrial, and conservation land uses.

During questioning, Ms. Caldwell did not respond to confirm if the square footage of each of the dwellings considered in her comparison included basements or garages. Based on the photographs, the proposed home would be consistent with the neighborhood, in her opinion.

Mr. LaRosa, a member of the Applicant LLC, having previously been sworn, explained that the square footages reflected on Ms. Caldwell's chart did not include garages. Mr. LaRosa further explained that the square footage figures were based on tax records and that the tax assessor had confirmed only finished living space, which would not include garages. During questioning as to whether the size of the proposed dwelling could be reduced, Mr. LaRosa refused to revise the proposal to reduce the square footage of the proposed dwelling, hence declining to reduce the FAR, impervious coverage, and density deviations, and instead he contended that the dwelling as proposed would be consistent to the "neighborhood."

As to which properties should be included when determining the applicable "neighborhood," Ms. Caldwell contended that, according to the MLUL, only those lots within 200 feet of the perimeter of the property should be considered within the applicable "neighborhood." Notwithstanding, she further explained that the initial analysis she conducted included only the immediately adjacent dwellings.

On the further discussion of the impact of the proposed dwelling on the neighborhood, Ms. Caldwell reviewed the photographs of each of the adjacent dwellings and, based thereon, reiterated her contention that the proposed dwelling would be consistent in size with other dwellings in the neighborhood.

Ms. Natalee Picilo Huber, having an address of 1302 Sky High Terrace (Lot 6), was duly sworn according to law. Ms. Huber vigorously objected to and opposed the application. She testified regarding her severe concerns about the impact of the Applicant's proposal on her family's immediately adjacent property, particularly given the severe water problems she and her family have experienced for years. She explained that she had spent approximately \$10,000 to fix drainage issues in her front yard. Ms. Huber testified that the proposed dwelling appears to be a large three-story dwelling (despite that the ground floor technically constitutes a cellar rather than a basement) with a full basement. She contended that the proposed home is not consistent with the neighborhood, particularly given its excessive size and the number, size, and height of the proposed retaining walls. She expressed concern with failure to properly maintain the stormwater management improvements, which would burden her and her family because stormwater runoff would overflow onto her lot. Ms. Huber also expressed significant concern about the proposed driveway location since it would be very close to the existing driveways on Sky High Terrace, resulting in safety concerns.

Fayez Fanik, having an address of 1301 Sky High Terrace (Lot 4), was duly sworn according to law. Mr. Fanik strongly objected to, and opposed, the application. He testified that he is concerned about the location and the safety of the proposed driveway. He expressed additional concern about such a proposal having an impact on his own property's enjoyment.

The applicant's attorney, Mr. Belardo, summarized the application and requested that the Board grant the requested relief based upon the proposal as submitted, after having an opportunity to discuss with his client the possibility of reducing the size of the proposed dwelling and/or otherwise modifying the proposal.

DECISION

The Board of Adjustment of the Township of Bridgewater, in the County of Somerset, found the application submitted by Skymanor Properties, LLC, for subsection d(4) FAR and bulk variance relief denied.

Roll Call Vote of Denial

Motion to Deny the application was made by Mr. Sweeney with a second by Mr. Weideli

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Ahern, Ms. Amin, and Mr. Weideli

DENIED: Mr. Foose, Mr. Fallone and Ms. Guttschall

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Fresco, Mr. La Spisa, Mr. Wrobel, and Mr Bongiorno

9. OTHER BOARD BUSINESS:

None.

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

There was no need for an Executive Session

8. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:

Members of the public wishing to make a comment to the Board on any matter not listed on the agenda were able to do so at this time. It was noted that any questions or comments about a pending application would need to be made in the hearing on that specific application. (This being in accordance with the Land Use law?)

No member of the public wished to address the Board.

The Board announced the next meeting and the scheduled applications for that evening.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30 pm with a motion made by Mr. Ahern and a second by Mr. Weideli.